

Advisory Team: Comprehensive School Support and Improvement

MINUTES

NOVEMBER 4, 2016

1:30-2:30PM

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
MANCHESTER CAMPUS

ADVISORY TEAM LEAD	Christopher N. Motika
NOTE TAKER	Title I Educational Consultants led small groups and took notes within their groups. Mary Bubnis, Richard Feistman, Peter Durso, Kathryn "Joey" Nichol, and Jane Waterhouse Andrea Reade from the Comprehensive Center also assisted in facilitation and note taking within a small group.
ATTENDEES	<p>Ann Allwarden – Conval School District Adrienne Baum – Manchester School District Siobhan Bergeron – Manchester School District Brandie Bolduc – University of New Hampshire Christine Brennan – Manchester School District Betsy Cox-Buteau – SAU 83 Caroline Butler – Somersworth School District Kristine Chamberlain – Conval School District Joanne DeBello – NH DOE – Bureau of Special Education Aprylle Desrosiers – John Stark Regional High School Sharon DeVincent – Manchester School District Julie Finley – SAU 18 – Franklin School District Cherrie Fulton – Nashua School District Melissa Gray – Manchester School District Robin Gregg – ConVal Regional School District Michael Harrington – Nashua School District Timothy Herbert – Pembroke School District Rebecca Hodge – SAU 7 Rachel Hopkins – Library Media Specialist Kate Josef – Manchester School District Cara Kuehl – SAU 10 – Derry Stephen LeClair – SAU 54 Dan LeGallo – Franklin School District Lisa L'Heureux – Manchester School District Kurk Lyons – Pembroke Academy Christi Michaud – Timberlane School District Pamela Miller – SAU 59 Ann Elise Record – SAU 3 Bonnie Skogsholm – Manchester School District Cynthia Sparks – SAU 61 Lynn Stanley – NH Afterschool Network Susan Uzdanovich – Manchester School District Michele Vance – SAU 8</p>
OBSERVERS	
PRE-READ MATERIALS	<p>-ESSA Comprehensive School Support and Improvement Webinar sent to all stakeholders and posted to the DOE Website.</p> <p>-ESSA Indicator 4.4 document with guiding questions. Sent to all stakeholders and posted to the DOE Website.</p>

DISCUSSION	
<p>Chris Motika opened the meeting and asked how many of the participants had viewed the webinar that had been sent and posted to the Comprehensive School Support and Improvement website. Very few participants acknowledged viewing the presentation, so Chris began the Advisory Team meeting by giving a ten minute overview of ESSA in order to provide context to the people in the room. He asked for a member of the team to be a timekeeper, and Siobhan Bergeron agreed to do so.</p> <p>The presentation focused on the context of ESSA as the newest reauthorization to ESEA. Chris discussed the major components of ESSA as well as the State's approach to creating the comprehensive state plan. He made note that this advisory team was only one of many teams addressing the state's entire plan. The presentation made special note that ESSA is to provide transparency, flexibility, and more equitable access to high quality education for all students, especially those who have traditionally been underserved.</p> <p>After eight minutes, the timekeeper signaled that time was nearly up. Chris asked if anyone had questions and then transitioned to the work session. He asked people to make smaller groups and to sit closer to one another to allow for small group discussion. He then assigned teams of Title I consultants to each group in order to help facilitate each group, answer questions, and take notes based on</p>	

stakeholder responses.

Once each group was seated together and consultants were in place at each group, Chris spent time discussing the protocol that would be used. He explained that the "Charrette" protocol had been modified for their use today and provides a "no stakes" environment to gain feedback. He read through the protocol, reading two group working norms (1. Respect all voices, and 2. No blaming) so that expectations for work was clear. He asked if anyone had questions about the protocol and no one did.

At this time, Chris directed the stakeholders' attention to a second handout, which included a breakdown of certain ESSA indicators. This breakdown consisted of standards that had been put into clear language (legal references and educational jargon had been removed), as well as a narrative of our current practices and guiding questions to push people's thinking forward as we consider the new law.

When reviewing the first indicator, Chris asked for clarifying questions as is called for in the protocol, and he responded with examples and clarification to each of two questions that were asked. At this point, there were no more clarifying questions and Chris turned the time over to the individual groups for discussion. After providing fifteen minutes for discussion on the first indicator, Chris moved on and read the second indicator, narrative about current practices, and guiding questions. Again, he asked for clarifying questions and there were none. The next fifteen minutes were spent by groups continuing their discussions.

With five minutes left, Chris stopped the groups and did a quick debrief of the process asking for suggestions for improving the process. The only response came from one participant who indicated she would like the materials e-mailed and available to other Title I teachers who might be able to give relevant feedback. Chris indicated that all materials would be sent out via Google Doc for asynchronous participation.

CONCLUSIONS

The work that took place during the session was very inclusive and open. Participants responded to the process very positively and recognized that New Hampshire does a lot of great things for kids under its current model.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Post small group notes on Indicators	Chris Motika	11/10/2016
Resend webinar of ESSA context	Chris Motika	11/15/2016
Continue drafting Indicators 4.4 for practical and easy use at December Advisory Team Meeting.	Chris Motika	11/28/2016
Open Google Doc for comments in asynchronous environment and send to participants	Chris Motika	11/10/2016